

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TONY CHENG,

Plaintiff,

v.

SCHLUMBERGER,

Defendant.

No. C 13-02641 JSW

**ORDER GRANTING REQUEST  
FOR COURT ORDER RE PAGE 4  
OF DOCKET 51.**

On August 30, 2013, the parties appeared before the Court for a status conference. At that status conference, the Court addressed Defendant's request to issues relating to Plaintiff's contacts with its current and/or former employees. (*See* Docket No. 51 (Opp. to Mot. to Compel Meet and Confer in Person at 4); Docket No. 67 (Minute Entry); Docket No. 70 (Transcript of Proceedings at 9:10-10:4).)

At the hearing, at the Court's inquiry, defense counsel advised the Court that they were representing Schlumberger Limited. (Transcript of Proceedings at 9:10-15.) The Court concluded that the issue of "affiliates" was not relevant but "the other requests that are contained on page 4 of Docket 51 shall be the order of the Court and will govern [Plaintiff's] ability to communicate with the other side." (Transcript of Proceedings at 9:21-25.) Plaintiff has requested that the Court confirm that page 4 of Docket 51 is an official court order.

In order to clear up any confusion, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff shall refrain from directly contacting current and/or former employees of Schlumberger Limited. All communications to current and/or former employees of Schlumberger Limited should be directed to said individuals through counsel of record for Schlumberger Limited.

2. Plaintiff's relatives shall refrain from contacting counsel for Defendant and/or employees of Schlumberger Limited.
3. The parties are directed to communicate during business hours only, from 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.
4. Any meet and confer conferences required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court's Local Rules, and/or as ordered by the Court shall be held between the parties by telephone. Only counsel of record and the parties to this litigation may be permitted to attend such conferences.

Finally, the Court notes that if Plaintiff wishes to communicate with a particular individual and he has any question as to whether that particular individual is a current and/or former employee of Schlumberger Limited, he should make that inquiry to counsel for Defendant in the first instance.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 16, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE